

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 16-22 are amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled, and portions of its subject matter incorporated into Claims 1 and 16-22. Claim 23 has been newly added. Claims 1-3 and 5-23 are now pending in the application. Support for Claim 23 can be found at least within paragraph [0073] of Applicant's specification. Thus, the amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed July 31, 2008 is addressed hereinafter.

I. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART—CLAIMS 1-11, 13-14, 16, and 18-21

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 16, and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Dell in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,051,243 to Helgren in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,206 to Domini.

Claim 1 now recites the one or more action mechanisms comprising at least one from a group consisting of toggle actions, wizard actions, and lockdown actions; wherein each of the action mechanisms has separate properties and characteristics and performs separate changes to the first configuration file. Claims 16-22 contain similar amendments.

In rejecting Claim 4, the Office Action relied upon Domini's columns 13, and FIGS. 3 and 4, stating that Domini discloses action mechanisms such as Change and Undo (Office Action, pages 5 and 6). However, these features are not what Claim 1 recites.

Toggle actions are used for toggling various parameters in the configuration information, as described in paragraphs [0064] and [0065] of Applicant's specification. The parameters being toggled can have two or more choices of values. Such a feature is not shown in Domini. Within Domini, no toggling or cycling of prospective values is shown. Using Domini's FIG. 3 as an example, a user cannot toggle through the displayed choices "engine" or "ensign", but instead must mouse over to the specific word and make their choice.

Wizard actions can result in a series of web pages, windows of a GUI, or other display steps that walk a user through a series of steps for completing a process, as described in paragraph [0066] of Applicant’s specification. Such a feature is not shown in Domini. Again using Domini’s FIG. 3 as an example, a single GUI window is shown, but Domini makes no suggesting of walking a user through a series of steps for completing any process, nor is a series of web pages shown. Within Domini, all interaction is with a single GUI.

When a lockdown action occurs, a configuration is set potentially without any user intervention or review (Applicant’s specification, paragraph [0068]). Such a feature is not shown in Domini. Within Domini, all adjustments require user intervention and occur through the GUI.

Finally, newly added Claim 23 recites an acceptability mechanism which checks the acceptability of any proposed configuration being contemplated by the user. None of the prior art discloses such a feature. Although Domini’s user interface takes user input, and makes suggestions to a user, the user’s input is never checked to ensure compatibility.

For at least the above reasons, the rejections of Claims 1 and 16-22 are unsupportable and should be withdrawn. Similarly, the rejections of all claims dependent therefrom are also unsupportable and should be withdrawn. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on their incorporation of limitations from the independent claims, as well as additional limitations that distinguish over cited art. Further, the dependent claims introduce additional features that render them patentable over the prior art. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, separate arguments are not provided at this time.

II. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application. Under MPEP Chapter 5, Applicant acknowledges that Internet communications may not be secure.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a check for the petition for extension of time fee and other applicable fees is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized charge to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/christophermtanner#41518/

Dated: September 26, 2008

Christopher M. Tanner
Reg. No. 41,518

ctanner@hptb-law.com
2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076